

Appl. No. 10/648,119
Amdt. Dated July 26, 2007
Reply to Office action of April 26, 2007

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in response to the Office action mailed April 26, 2007. Claims 1-15 are rejected over Hamilton and Day. Applicant has partially amended the claims, and all these amendments have been made without adding new matters.

Applicant appreciates Examiner's careful review and consideration of the present application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 3, 5, 11, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In response:

Re claim 3, Applicants have added a definite article "the" before "port performance" in the middle of line 2.

Re claims 5 and 11, Applicants have clearly addressed "display definitions" by adding the definition "information on display definitions comprises colors corresponding to different traffic volume statuses and image configurations that respectively represent two duplex statuses" to claims 5 and 11. It is submitted that the meaning of "display definitions" is now clearly addressed in claims 5 and 11.

Re claim 14, Applicants have added "the" before "display definitions" on line 2, thus the "display definitions" in claim 11 can be the antecedent basis thereof.

Appl. No. 10/648,119
Amdt. Dated July 26, 2007
Reply to Office action of April 26, 2007

Said amendments are based on the disclosure of the original application, no new matter is added, and should be allowed.

Because amended claim 11 is now definite and clear, the rejection to claims 12-15 dependent thereon should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamilton et al. (US Pat. 6,975,963 B2) in view of Day (US Pat. 7,168,049 B2).

In Response:

With regard to claims 1-6:

Applicants respectfully traverse Examiner's rejection of claim 1 for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites "...a plurality of port information pages each comprising a simulative figure for simulating a front panel of a respective network device, and for displaying information on ports of the network device, the simulative figure comprising a plurality of port icons for displaying traffic volume statuses and duplex statuses for corresponding ports respectively with different colors and image configurations."

Examiner states to the effect that the port performance 512 of Hamilton et al. is same to the simulative figure of the present application. As shown in FIG 5 of Hamilton et al., the port performance 512 provides a performance curve for presenting the performance of data storage networks. In the present application, the simulative figure is used for simulating a front panel of a network device, which provides an instant visualization of port

Appl. No. 10/648,119

Amdt. Dated July 26, 2007

Reply to Office action of April 26, 2007

performance of network devices in a more intuitive manner, as described in the Summary. The ways of presenting performance data between Hamilton et al. and the present application are substantially different.

Examiner also states that the time range display 516 and the histogram display 518 of Hamilton et al. are the same as the port icons of the present application. In claim 1, the port icons have been defined for displaying traffic volume statuses and duplex statuses for corresponding ports respectively with different colors and image configurations. With Hamilton, 516 and 518 are in fact menus with which users can select different time ranges to view the performance of the network component and select a histogram display, and do not in any way convey performance data of a current network component. Obviously, the functions of the different colors and image configurations of the present application are rather different from that of the different time ranges and histogram display manner of Hamilton et al.

Further, the icons of Day are similar to 516 and 518 in Hamilton, in that they reveal users choices. In Day, the choices pertain to allocation of computing resources. Therefore, the icons of Day also do not convey performance data of a network component. Therefore, since neither Hamilton nor Day reveal or teach icons that indicate performance data of a network component, applicants assert that even if one skilled in the art combined the teachings of Hamilton with that of Day he could not arrive at the present invention.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Day does not disclose or give any teachings to the above-described differences. That is, claim 1 is submitted to be unobvious and patentable over Hamilton et al. in view of Day under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Claims 2-6 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1, and are

Appl. No. 10/648,119
Amtd. Dated July 26, 2007
Reply to Office action of April 26, 2007

incorporated with more features, which should also be patentable over Hamilton et al. in view of Day under 35 U.S.C. 103.

With regard to claims 7-10:

For reasons similar to those detailed above in relation to claim 1, Applicants assert that claim 7 is unobvious and patentable over Hamilton et al. in view of Day under 35 U.S.C. 103. Accordingly, dependent claims 8-10 should also be patentable over Hamilton et al. in view of Day under 35 U.S.C. 103.

With regard to claims 11-15:

For reasons similar to those detailed above in relation to claim 1, Applicants assert that claim 11 is unobvious and patentable over Hamilton et al. in view of Day under 35 U.S.C. 103. Accordingly, dependent claims 12-15 should also be patentable over Hamilton et al. in view of Day under 35 U.S.C. 103.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing Amendment and Response place this application in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, please call the undersigned at 714.626.1240.

Respectfully submitted,
Yi-Chien Chen

Appl. No. 10/648,119
Amdt. Dated July 26, 2007
Reply to Office action of April 26, 2007

By 

Wei-Ts/Chung

Registration No.: 43,325
Please recognize the application with Customer No. 25,859
Foxconn International, Inc.
P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel. No.: (408) 919-6137